



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,196	06/21/2005	Richard Emberton	ORCL5800	6374
53156 7590 02/19/2008 YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C. 4370 ALPINE RD. STE. 106 PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028			EXAMINER SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/510,196

Applicant(s)

EMBERTON ET AL.

Examiner

MOHAMMAD A. SIDDIQI

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-13,15-19,21-24,26-29,31 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-13,15-19,21-24,26-29,31 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19, 21-24, 26-29, and 31-32 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 8, 14, 20, 25, and 30 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,3-7,9-13, 15-19, 21-24, 26-29, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poplawski et. al. (2003/0208441) (Hereinafter Poplawski).

4. As per claims 1, 7, and 13, Poplawski discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method, system, and machine-readable medium of processing notifications issued by a plurality of computer processes, at least some of the notifications notifying the user of a business

Art Unit: 2154

event that requires the user make a decision, the method comprising the steps of:

providing a notification server that is configured to receive the notifications from the plurality of computer process (20, fig 3; page 2, para #0030-#0031);

receiving the notifications in the notification server over a network (20, fig 3; page 2, para #0030-#0031);

providing a notification application running on the notification server (20, fig 3; page 2, para #0030-#0031);

filtering (CSP/BSP loads the bulk raw billing data and out of the bulk data generate only upcoming bills, page 2, para #0030-#0031), by the notification application (e-mail notification; page 2, para #0030-#0031), the received notifications to identify those (CSP/BSP loads the bulk raw billing data and out of the bulk data generate only upcoming bills, page 2, para #0030-#0031) of the received notifications that require a decision from the user (20, fig 7; page 3, #0043);

displaying links (page 2, para #0028; page 3, para #0035, URL), within the notification application, to the identified notifications (Page 2, para #0028- #0031);

when the user selects one of the displayed links (page 2, para #0028; page 3, para #0035, URL), displaying the received notification that

Art Unit: 2154

corresponds to the selected link within the notification application ((page 2, para #0028; page 3, para #0035, URL) ;

requesting that the user make a decision (bill payment, Page 2, para #0029, page 3, para #0035) relative to the displayed notification (Page 2, para #0029, page 3, para #0035);

generating a reply to the displayed notification (page 3, para #0044), within the notification application and according to the decision made by the user (e-mail application/browser, 22, fig 4, page 3, para #0035-#0044);

formatting the generated reply according to the computer process of the plurality of computer that issued the displayed notification(s-500, fig 7, page 3, para #0044), and

sending (s-500, fig 7, page 3, para #0044), over the network (communication network, fig 7), the formatted reply from the notification application to the computer process that issued the displayed notification (S-565, fig 7, page 3, para #0044). Poplawski fails to disclose the limitation such as filtering by the notification application. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Poplawski by specifying the CSP/BSP loads the bulk raw billing data and out of the bulk data generates by filtering based on the priorities, past due bill, or unpaid bills to notify bill payers the urgency of actions required based on the

Art Unit: 2154

priorities, past due bill, or unpaid bills from bill payers (common practice by collection system).

5. As per claims 3, 9, and 15, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses wherein the link displaying step displays the links in a portal (page 2, para #0030).

6. As per claims 4, 10, and 16, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses wherein the displaying steps are carried out on a mobile device (page 2, para #0022).

7. As per claims 5, 11, and 17, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses the displaying step are carried out by a computing device coupled to the plurality of computer processes by a computer network (page 2, para #0028-0030).

8. As per claims 6, 12, and 18, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses the link displaying step displays a link to each of the received notifications (page 2, para #0028).

Art Unit: 2154

9. As per claims 19, 23, and 28, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses a method for a mobile device to process notifications issued by a plurality of computer processes, at least some of the notifications notifying the user of the mobile devices of a business event that requires the user to make decision, the method comprising the steps of:

- providing a notification server that is selectively accessible to the mobile device (page para #0022) a network and that is configured to receive the notifications from the processes (20, fig 3; page 2, para #0030-#0031);

- receiving by the notification server, the issued notifications (page 2, para #0031);

- providing a notification application running on the notification server;

- filtering (CSP/BSP loads the bulk raw billing data and out of the bulk data generate only upcoming bills, page 2, para #0030-#0031), by the notification application, the notifications received by the notification server to identify (CSP/BSP loads the bulk raw billing data and out of the bulk data generate only upcoming bills, page 2, para #0030-#0031) those of the received notifications that require a decision from the user (20, fig 7; page 3, #0043);

Art Unit: 2154

providing links to the identified notifications on the mobile device (bill payment, Page 2, para#0022; para #0029, page 3, para #0035);

when the user of the mobile device selects one of the provided links, displaying on the mobile device the received notification that corresponds to the selected link (bill payment, Page 2, para#0022; para #0029; page 3, para #0035);

requesting that the user make a decision on the mobile device relative to the displayed notification (bill payment, Page 2, para#0022; para #0029, page 3, para #0035);

generating a reply to the displayed notification (fig 7, page 3, para #0044), within the notification application and according to the decision made by the user;

formatting the generated reply according to the computer process of the plurality of computer processes that issued the displayed notification (S-500, fig 7, page 3, para #0044), and

sending, over the network, the formatted reply from the notification application to the computer process that issued the displayed notification (S-565, fig 7, page 3, para #0044).

10. As per claim 20, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses wherein the link providing step

Art Unit: 2154

provides links corresponding to a selectable subset of the received notifications (page 2, para #0029).

11. As per claim 21, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses wherein the link providing step displays the links in a portal accessible to the mobile device and to the user (page 2, para #0029-#0030).

12. As per claim 22, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses wherein the link providing step provides a link to each of the received notifications (page 2, para #0029-#0030).

13. As per claims 24 and 29, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 19, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses the mobile device is one of a telephone, a personal digital assistant and a pager (page 2, para #0022).

14. As per claims 26 and 31, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 19, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses the link providing step displays the links in a portal accessible to the mobile device and to the user

Art Unit: 2154

(page 2, para #0022).

15. As per claims 27 and 32, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 19, above. In addition, Poplawski discloses wherein the link providing step provides a link to each of the received notifications (page 2, para #0029-#0030).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19, 21-24, 26-29, and 31-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US 2002/0161699

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE**

Art Unit: 2154

FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMMAD A. SIDDIQI whose telephone number is (571)272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MAS

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2826